

## REMARKS

The present amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action dated July 28, 2006, which set a three-month period for response, making this amendment due by October 28, 2006.

Claims 7-9 and 11-21 are pending in this application.

In the Office Action, the allowability of claims 7-9 and 11-21 was withdrawn. Claims 7, 11, 12, 15, and 21 now were rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 9 of U.S. Patent No. 6,652,601. Claim 18 was rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,669,739. Claim 18 was rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 10 of U.S. Patent No. 6,740,128. Claims 13 and 14 were rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 9 of U.S. Patent No. 6,652,601 in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,513,142 to Raue et al. Claims 16 and 17 were rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 6, 8, and 9 of U.S. Patent No. 6,652,601. Claim 18 was rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 10 of U.S. Patent No. 7,056,348. Claims 8 and 9 were rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 9 of U.S. Patent No. 6,652,601 in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,171,347 to

Kunz et al. Claims 19 and 20 were rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 9 of U.S. Patent No. 6,740,128 in view of Kunz et al. Claims 19 and 20 were rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 9 of U.S. Patent No. 6,669,739 in view of Kunz et al. Claims 19 and 20 were further rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 9 of U.S. Patent No. 7,056,348 in view of Kunz et al.

In response to the above rejections, all of which are based on nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting, filed herewith are terminal disclaimers filed in accordance with 37 CFR 1.321(c), which address each of the rejections set forth in the Office Action. It is noted that a terminal Disclaimer with respect to patent No. 6,652,601 has been previously filed on September 8, 2005.

The Applicants therefore respectfully submit that claims 7-9 and 11-21 are allowable, since the respective terminal disclaimers obviate the outstanding rejections. Reinstatement of the allowance of claims 7-9 and 11-21 is respectfully requested.

**REQUEST FOR CORRECTION OF NAME OF LEAD INVENTOR FROM  
MANUELA KUNZ TO MANUELA JAVET**

It is noted a Petition has previously been filed to change the name of the lead inventor from Manuela Kunz and Manuela Javet in view of her marriage.

This petition was granted on April 5, 2005 and a copy of the Decision Granting the Petition is attached hereto.

It is requested tht the name of Manuela Kunz be deleted in all respects and replace with the name Manuela JAVET.

Should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, the undersigned would very much welcome a telephone call in order to discuss and resolve any remaining issues to place the application into condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Striker  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No.: 27233  
103 East Neck Road  
Huntington, New York 11743  
631-549-4700